



**BEFORE THE ADJUDICATING OFFICER
SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA
[ADJUDICATION ORDER NO. Order/MS/KS/2026-27/32482]**

UNDER SECTION 15-I OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA ACT, 1992 READ WITH RULE 5 OF SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE BOARD OF INDIA (PROCEDURE FOR HOLDING INQUIRY AND IMPOSING PENALTIES) RULES, 1995.

In respect of:

ANJU RANI

(PAN: AJCPR9744F)

In the matter of dealing in Illiquid Stocks Options at BSE

FACTS OF THE CASE IN BRIEF

1. Securities and Exchange Board of India (hereinafter referred to as “**SEBI**”) observed large scale reversal of trades in the Illiquid Stock Options (hereinafter also referred to as “**ISO**”) on BSE Ltd. (hereinafter referred to as “**BSE**”) leading to creation of artificial volume. In view of the same, SEBI conducted an investigation into the trading activities of certain entities in ISO on BSE for the period starting from April 1, 2014 to September 30, 2015 (hereinafter referred to as “**Investigation Period/ IP**”).
2. Investigation by SEBI revealed that during the IP, a total of 2,91,744 trades comprising 81.41% of all the trades executed in stock options segment of BSE were trades involving reversal of buy and sell positions by the clients and counterparties in a contract. In these trades, entities reversed their buy or sell position in a contract with subsequent sell or buy position with the same counterparty. These reversal trades were alleged to be non-genuine as they lacked basic trading rationale and allegedly portrayed false or misleading appearance of trading leading to creation of artificial volume in those contracts.



In view of the same, such reversal trades were alleged to be deceptive and manipulative in nature.

3. During the IP, 14,720 entities were found to have executed non-genuine trades in BSE's stock options segment. It was observed that Ms. Anju Rani (PAN – AJCPR9744F) (hereinafter referred to as the **"Noticee"**) was one of the various entities who indulged in execution of reversal trades in stock options segment of BSE during the IP. Her trades were alleged to be non-genuine in nature which created false or misleading appearance of trading in terms of artificial volumes in stock options. Therefore, her trades were alleged to be manipulative and deceptive in nature. In view of the same, SEBI initiated adjudication proceedings against the Noticee for alleged violation of the provisions of regulations 3(a), (b), (c), (d), 4(1) and 4(2)(a) of SEBI (Prohibition of Fraudulent and Unfair Trade Practices) Regulations, 2003 (hereinafter referred to as **"PFUTP Regulations"**).

APPOINTMENT OF ADJUDICATING OFFICER

4. SEBI Pursuant to transfer of the case from erstwhile Adjudicating Officer(s) (hereinafter referred to as **"AO(s)"**), the undersigned was appointed as AO in the matter vide communique dated June 01, 2026, under section 15-I of the Securities and Exchange Board of India Act, 1992 (hereinafter referred to as the **"SEBI Act"**) read with rule 3 of SEBI (Procedure for Holding Inquiry and Imposing Penalties) Rules, 1995 (hereinafter referred to as **"Rules"**), to inquire into and adjudge under the provisions of section 15HA of the SEBI Act for the alleged violations by the Noticee.

SHOW CAUSE NOTICE, REPLY AND HEARING

5. A Show Cause Notice dated August 31, 2021 (hereinafter referred to as **"SCN"**) was issued to the Noticee under rule 4(1) of Rules to show cause as to why an inquiry should not be held and penalty, if any, should not be imposed upon her for the alleged violations of the provisions of regulations 3(a), (b), (c), (d), 4(1)



and 4(2)(a) of the PFUTP Regulations. It was inter alia alleged in the SCN that the Noticee had executed 2 non-genuine trades in 1 Stock Options contract which resulted in artificial volume of total 20,000 units. The SCN was served on the last known addresses of the Noticee through Speed Post Acknowledgement Due (hereinafter referred to as “**SPAD**”) and by e-mail. In this regard, response from the Noticee is not available on record.

6. Subsequently, a Post SCN Intimation (hereinafter referred to as “**PSI**”) dated August 04, 2022 was issued to the Noticee, at the last known addresses of the Noticee. It was stated in the intimation that SEBI had brought Settlement Scheme, i.e., SEBI Settlement Scheme, 2022 (hereinafter referred to as “**Settlement Scheme 2022**”) in terms of regulation 26 of Settlement Regulations. The applicable period of the scheme was August 22, 2022 to November 21, 2022. Later, the applicable period of the Settlement Scheme 2022 was extended to January 21, 2023 by SEBI. The notice returned undelivered through SPAD and successfully served at the email of the Noticee.
7. Subsequently, another PSI dated March 05, 2024 was issued to Noticee to the last known address of Noticee and by email regarding another settlement scheme 2024 in terms of regulation 26 of Settlement Regulations. The period of the scheme was commenced from March 11, 2024 to May 10, 2024. The SPAD was returned undelivered while the email successfully delivered to the Noticee.
8. Subsequently, vide email dated February 20, 2025, the son of the Noticee viz., Mr. Nitin Agarwal stated that her mother was not well for the last 10 years and submitted the death certificate of his mother viz., Anju Rani. The details of death certificate are verified from the website of Birth & Death Registration, Office of the Registrar General & Census Commissioner, India, Ministry of Home Affairs and I note in this regard that Noticee passed away on January 12, 2025.



9. Before proceeding further in the matter on merit, it would be in the fitness of things to first decide as to whether on the death of the Noticee, the present adjudication proceedings against her would continue or abate.
10. In this regard, it is worth considering that in the matter of *Girijanandini Devi v. Bijendra Narain Choudhary* (AIR 1967 SC 1124), the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that in case of personal actions, i.e., the actions where the relief sought is personal to the deceased, the right to sue will not survive to or against the representatives and in such cases the maxim *actio personalis moritur cum persona* (personal action dies with the death of the person) would apply. It is also relevant to refer to the decision of Hon'ble Securities Appellate Tribunal in *Chandravadan J. Dalal v. SEBI* (Appeal No. 35/2004 decided on June 15, 2005) wherein it was held that: *"The appeal abates since the appellant during the pendency of the appeal died on 29th November 2004. The appeal accordingly abates. The penalty imposed on the original appellant being personal in nature also abates."*
11. In view of the foregoing, I am of the view that the instant adjudication proceedings against the Noticee are liable to be abated without going into the merits of the case qua her and the SCN dated August 31, 2021 issued against her is disposed of accordingly.
12. In terms of the provisions of rule 6 of the Rules, a copy of this order is being sent to SEBI, to the last known addresses of deceased Noticee and to Ms. Anju Rani, who provided the death certificate of the deceased Noticee.

Place: Mumbai
Date: July 14, 2026

MEDHA SONPAROTE
ADJUDICATING OFFICER